

The Schmidt number as a universal entanglement measure

J. Sperling* and W. Vogel†

Arbeitsgruppe Quantenoptik, Institut für Physik, Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany

(Dated: August 27, 2009)

For the quantification of entanglement universal entanglement measures are defined, which are invariant under local invertible transformations. They quantify entanglement in a very general sense. It is shown that the Schmidt number is a universal entanglement measure, which is most important for the general amount of entanglement. For special applications pseudo-measures are defined to quantify the useful entanglement for a certain task. The entanglement quantification is further specified by operational measures, which include the accessible observables by a given experimental setup. To implement a universal entanglement quantification, methods are introduced to derive optimal entanglement witnesses and quasi-probabilities for Schmidt number states.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud, 42.50.Dv

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement is the key resource of the vast fields of Quantum Information Processing, Quantum Computation, and Quantum Technology, for an introduction see e.g. [1, 2]. For example, applications of entangled states are those for quantum key distribution [3], quantum dense coding [4], and quantum teleportation [5]. Thus both the identification and the quantification of entanglement play a mayor role for future applications [6].

The phenomenon entanglement is closely related to the superposition principle of quantum mechanics. A pure separable state is represented by a product of states for both systems. A general pure state is a superposition of factorizable states. The number of superpositions of factorizable states is given by the Schmidt rank [1]. A separable mixed quantum state is a convex combination of pure factorizable quantum states [7]. The generalization of the Schmidt rank to mixed quantum states delivers the Schmidt number. This generalization and the introduction of Schmidt number witnesses is given in [8, 9, 10]. The Schmidt number of a mixed quantum state fulfills the axioms of an entanglement measure, cf. [11, 12, 13]. More precisely, it is a convex roof measure as defined in [14, 15].

Since the amount of entanglement cannot increase under local operations and classical communication, all entanglement measures must satisfy the local operations and classical communication (LOCC) paradigm. But in general, different entanglement measures do not deliver the same ordering of entangled quantum states [16]. It is important to note that for a given quantum task an adequate definition of the corresponding LOCC plays a crucial rule for the entanglement quantification. Maximally entangled states are usually considered to have the highest amount of entanglement. It turns out that for different quantum tasks different kinds of entangle-

ment are beneficial [17]. The experimentally demonstrated possibility of noise-free linear amplification makes a larger class of separable operations accessible [18]. Recently, it has been shown that these separable operations can increase entanglement with respect to certain measures [19]. This necessitates a careful consideration of local invertible transformations in the context of entanglement measures. It is also important that all entangled quantum states have some usable amount of entanglement, nonlocality, and potential applications for quantum processing [20, 21, 22]. The inclusion of all these aspects requires a critical study of the entanglement quantification.

In the present contribution we study entanglement measures and especially the Schmidt number. We discuss the notion of maximally entangled states in connection with an arbitrary entanglement measure. We conclude that in the most general sense the available amount of entanglement depends on the Schmidt number. We also define pseudo-measures and operational measures, which quantify the entanglement for a specific quantum task and for a special experimental setup, respectively. We provide the methods that deliver all optimized Schmidt number witnesses. Further on, the optimization yields entanglement quasi-distributions in terms of Schmidt number states. The negativities in these distributions are necessary and sufficient to identify the Schmidt number of a given quantum state.

The paper is structured as follows. In Sec. II we discuss general entanglement measures and their properties in relation to one special entanglement measure – the Schmidt number. The definition of entanglement pseudo-measures and their application to an arbitrary experimental situation is given in Sec. III. In Sec. IV we propose a method for obtaining optimized linear conditions for the Schmidt number of a quantum state, as well as the related quasi-probability distributions. A summary and some conclusions are given in Sec. V.

*Electronic address: jan.sperling2@uni-rostock.de

†Electronic address: werner.vogel@uni-rostock.de

II. ENTANGLEMENT MEASURES

In this section we consider special properties of entanglement measures in connection with LOCC. Starting with the given definitions of entanglement measures we obtain some properties which indicate a fundamental rule of the Schmidt number. Here and in the following we assume finite, but arbitrary dimensional Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$. The generalization for continuous variable entanglement directly follows from the method of finite spaces as presented in Ref. [23].

A. The LOCC Paradigm and Entanglement Measures

Entanglement measures are usually defined by using LOCC. Therefore an accurate definition of these operations is essential for understanding entanglement measures. The general idea of a LOCC is a map that cannot create entanglement. Therefore let us write the most general form of such a map Λ , cf. [2], the separable operations $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{sep}}$:

$$\Lambda(\rho) = \sum_i [A_i \otimes B_i] \rho [A_i \otimes B_i]^\dagger. \quad (1)$$

The quantum state will be normalized by

$$\rho \mapsto \rho' = \frac{\Lambda(\rho)}{\text{tr } \Lambda(\rho)}. \quad (2)$$

The operations in the set $\mathcal{C}_{\text{sep}}$ are also called stochastic local filtering operations. An important subset is $\mathcal{C}_{\text{LU}}$, which denotes all local unitaries $[U_1 \otimes U_2] \rho [U_1 \otimes U_2]^\dagger$.

A substructure $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$ of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{sep}}$ is defined by all $\Lambda \in \mathcal{X}$ and all compositions of elements of $\mathcal{X}$,

$$\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Lambda_1 \circ \Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}. \quad (3)$$

This algebraic structure of a semigroup must at least include local changes of the basis by local unitaries $\mathcal{C}_{\text{LU}}$. Here and in the following, we will call such a substructure, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$, LOCC. These particular LOCC are the applied operations for a special quantum task, for example quantum key distribution [3], quantum dense coding [4], or quantum teleportation [5]. Some subclasses are given in [2]. Beside these substructures we define the following LOCC.

$\mathcal{C}_{\text{LI}}$, *local invertibles*: Operations of the form

$$\rho \mapsto [T_1 \otimes T_2] \rho [T_1 \otimes T_2]^\dagger, \quad (4)$$

with T_1 and T_2 invertible, are called local invertibles. Note that for any operation exists an inverse operation given by T_1^{-1} and T_2^{-1} . Further on, the LOCC $\mathcal{C}_{\text{LI}}$ include the identity, $\mathbb{I}_1 \otimes \mathbb{I}_2$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{LI}}$ is a group.

$\mathcal{C}_{\text{LP}}$, *local Projections*: In addition to all local unitaries this set contains all local projections given by

$$\rho \mapsto [P_1 \otimes P_2] \rho [P_1 \otimes P_2], \quad (5)$$

with P_1 and P_2 projection operators.

Now we can define a general entanglement measure E , which must fulfill the following definition, see [6].

Definition 1 E is an entanglement measure, if:

- (i) σ separable $\Leftrightarrow E(\sigma) = 0$,
- (ii) $\forall \Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}} : E(\rho) \geq E\left(\frac{\Lambda(\rho)}{\text{tr } \Lambda(\rho)}\right)$.

Usually, a third condition is that an entanglement measure must be invariant under local unitaries. However, Condition (ii) implies that the additional invariance under local unitaries is superfluous, see Appendix A. Note that, instead of Condition (ii) often a non-increasing behavior on average of the entanglement measure is considered, cf. our related comments in Sec. II E.

Last but not least, Definition 1 depends on the chosen LOCC. Thus the precise mathematical definition of the LOCC $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$ – as given above – is crucial for the measure itself. The physical interpretation of LOCC is given in Sec. III.

B. Example: Schmidt Number

A prominent example for an entanglement measure is the Schmidt rank r_S . Let us consider the pure state $|\Psi\rangle$ with a Schmidt decomposition [2],

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{r(\Psi)} \lambda_n |e_n, f_n\rangle, \quad (6)$$

with the Schmidt rank $r(\Psi)$, the Schmidt coefficients $\lambda_k > 0$ and $\{|e_k\rangle\}_{k=1\dots r}$, $\{|f_k\rangle\}_{k=1\dots r}$ being orthonormal in $\mathcal{H}_1$, $\mathcal{H}_2$, respectively. Any mixed quantum state ρ is a convex combination of pure states,

$$\rho = \sum_k p_k |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k|, \quad (7)$$

and each vector $|\psi_k\rangle$ of this decomposition has an individual Schmidt rank. For this distinct decomposition the Schmidt rank of ρ is given by the maximal Schmidt rank of all vectors. The Schmidt number of the mixed quantum state is given by the minimal Schmidt rank of ρ for all possible decompositions,

$$r_S(\rho) = \inf\{r_{\text{max}} : \rho = \sum_k p_k |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k| \text{ and } r_{\text{max}} = \sup_k r(\psi_k)\}. \quad (8)$$

For a pure state the Schmidt rank is identical to the Schmidt number, and it counts the minimal number of superpositions of factorizable states needed to generate the state under study. Hence, in the following we will throughout use the notion Schmidt number. The definition of the Schmidt number implies that the suitable

LOCC in Definition 1 is the complete set $\mathcal{C}_{\text{sep}}$. For separable quantum states the Schmidt number is equal to 1. The simple shift, $r_S \rightarrow r_S - 1$, delivers Condition (i) in the definition for entanglement measures, with $E = r_S - 1$.

In the following let us consider some basic properties of arbitrary entanglement measures and their connection with the Schmidt number. It will become clear that the Schmidt coefficients λ_n as given in Eq. (6) play a minor role compared with the Schmidt number for the quantification of entanglement. The Schmidt number delivers a discrete and monotonous quantification of quantum states with respect to entanglement.

C. Local Invertables and Maximally Entangled States

Let E be an entanglement measure, and ρ_{max} is maximally entangled,

$$\forall \rho : E(\rho_{\text{max}}) \geq E(\rho). \quad (9)$$

Now let us define a new entanglement measure,

$$E'(\rho) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} E\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{LI}}(\rho)}{\text{tr } \Lambda_{\text{LI}}(\rho)}\right), \quad (10)$$

with a local invertable operation Λ_{LI} . If E is defined by the LOCC $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$, then E' is defined by $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}'}$. An element Λ' of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}'}$ has the form

$$\Lambda' = \Lambda_{\text{LI}}^{-1} \circ \Lambda \circ \Lambda_{\text{LI}}, \quad \text{with } \Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}. \quad (11)$$

Obviously E' is an entanglement measure for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}'}$, for details see Appendix A. The state ρ'_{max} satisfies Eq. (9) for the measure E' ,

$$\rho'_{\text{max}} = \frac{\Lambda_{\text{LI}}^{-1}(\rho_{\text{max}})}{\text{tr } \Lambda_{\text{LI}}^{-1}(\rho_{\text{max}})}. \quad (12)$$

This new entanglement measure has some surprising properties. Let us consider the entangled states $\rho = |\phi_r\rangle\langle\phi_r|$, with

$$|\phi_r\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \sum_{k=1}^r |k, k\rangle, \quad (13)$$

which are often considered as maximally entangled, and a local invertable transformation given by T ,

$$T = U_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^r \sqrt{r} \lambda_k |k\rangle\langle k| \right) \otimes U_2, \quad (14)$$

for arbitrary $\lambda_k > 0$, and arbitrary unitaries U_1 and U_2 . Obviously, $T|\phi_r\rangle = \sum_k \lambda_k U_1|k\rangle \otimes U_2|k\rangle$ is an arbitrary pure entangled state with the Schmidt number r and Schmidt coefficients λ_k . A local invertable transformation changes the Schmidt coefficients, whereas the Schmidt number remains unchanged.

The state $T|\phi_r\rangle$ is in general not maximally entangled for E . But, this state is maximally entangled with respect to E' , and $|\phi_r\rangle$ is not maximally entangled for E' . An exception is an entanglement measure which is invariant under local invertables. Thus the question arises which role play the Schmidt coefficients for the quantification?

Definition 2 *An entanglement measure, which is invariant under all local invertables, elements of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{LI}}$, is called universal entanglement measure.*

Note that such local invertable operations have recently been experimentally demonstrated in the context of noiseless amplification [18]. An example for a universal entanglement measure is the Schmidt number r_S , since $\mathcal{C}_{\text{sep}}$ includes $\mathcal{C}_{\text{LI}}$.

For any maximally entangled state with respect to E , we can create a new entanglement measure E' together with a locally transformed state which is maximally entangled with respect to E' . The states $|\phi_r\rangle$ as defined in Eq. (13) are often called maximally entangled. From our considerations it becomes obvious that this notion is justified only for special measures E , it becomes meaningless in a more general context.

The other way around, any pure state with the same Schmidt number can be considered to be maximally entangled for the universal measure, E_{uni} ,

$$E_{\text{uni}}(\rho) = \sup_{\Lambda_{\text{LI}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{LI}}} E\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{LI}}(\rho)}{\text{tr } \Lambda_{\text{LI}}(\rho)}\right). \quad (15)$$

E_{uni} is invariant for pure states with the same Schmidt number but different Schmidt coefficients, the generalization to mixed states is given in Sec. II E.

Observation 1 *If the LOCC, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$, defining the measure E include the set of local invertables, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{LI}}$, then the entanglement measure is a universal entanglement measure, and E does not depend on the Schmidt coefficients.* ■

From the physical point of view it is clear that the number of nonlocal superpositions (the Schmidt number) is a good characterization of entanglement. Since local invertable transformations conserve the Schmidt number, the latter itself may serve as a universal entanglement measure.

It has been shown, that classes of separable operations can eventually increase the entanglement of a quantum state with respect to a given measure [19]. Especially, this problem occurs for entanglement measures using LOCC for distillation protocols only. Obviously, the definition of distillability and entanglement are different. Thus they must be differently quantified. If the amount of entanglement is considered, then Definition 2 is a natural consequence of this section. For the quantification of the ability to perform certain quantum tasks, we refer to Sec. III.

D. Schmidt Rank Monotones

Let us consider entanglement measures defined by the LOCC $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$ which includes local projections, which is a weak requirement. Such a measure is not deterministic [2]. The projection P ,

$$P = \left(\sum_{k=1}^{r-1} |k\rangle\langle k| \right) \otimes \mathbb{I}_2, \quad (16)$$

maps the state $|\phi_r\rangle$ to $|\phi_{r-1}\rangle$. The LOCC Condition (ii) in Definition 1 delivers $E(|\phi_r\rangle\langle\phi_r|) \geq E(|\phi_{r-1}\rangle\langle\phi_{r-1}|)$. In general, a pure state with a given Schmidt number contains less entanglement than a pure state with a higher Schmidt number. The next section implies the same result for mixed states.

Observation 2 *Any entanglement measure is a monotone of the Schmidt number.* ■

This means that a sequence of quantum states with decreasing number of nonlocal superpositions, cannot increase its entanglement with respect to E . Thus, the entanglement of Schmidt number states, for a given r , delivers upper boundaries for any measure and arbitrary quantum states with a Schmidt number $< r$.

E. Mixed quantum states, and measuring entanglement measures

Let us consider an arbitrary mixed quantum state $\sigma_r = \sum_k p_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|$ with a Schmidt number $r_S(\sigma_r) = r$. This state can be generated by an arbitrary pure state $|\tilde{\psi}_r\rangle$ – with the Schmidt number r – and an LOCC operation $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{sep}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_r &= \Lambda(|\tilde{\psi}_r\rangle\langle\tilde{\psi}_r|) \\ &= \sum_k (A_k \otimes B_k) |\tilde{\psi}_r\rangle\langle\tilde{\psi}_r| (A_k \otimes B_k)^\dagger \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

with

$$A_k \otimes B_k |\tilde{\psi}_r\rangle = \sqrt{p_k} |\psi_k\rangle \quad (18)$$

as explained above by local invertables and local projections. Let us call the pure state $|\tilde{\psi}_r\rangle$ the generator of σ_r . From the property (ii) of an entanglement measure, we can conclude that for each generator $|\tilde{\psi}_r\rangle$ of the state σ_r holds

$$E(|\tilde{\psi}_r\rangle\langle\tilde{\psi}_r|) \geq E(\sigma_r). \quad (19)$$

Thus we can formulate the following observation.

Observation 3 *The generator of any mixed quantum state has an equal or a larger amount of entanglement as the mixed quantum state, and under all states ρ_{max} satisfying Eq. (9) must exist a pure state.* ■

This statement generalizes Observations 1 and 2 to mixed quantum states.

In general, entanglement measures are defined by a mathematical background. The various definitions of entanglement measures are usually not usable to perform any experiment, which delivers the value of the entanglement measure for the state under study as a direct outcome. The other way around, a general experimental setup cannot use every kind of entanglement, for example bound entangled states for a distillation protocol. Moreover, it turns out that the states $|\phi_r\rangle$ – with equally distributed Schmidt coefficients – are not the best ones to perform, for example, quantum computation, see [17]. An entanglement measure optimized for a special experimental setup needs to be found. And for this experiment we need to find the suitable set of LOCC, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$.

F. Entanglement on average

Sometimes Condition (ii) in Definition 1 is replaced by a stronger condition

$$(ii') \quad \forall \Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}} : \rho \xrightarrow{\Lambda} \sum_k p_k \rho_k \Rightarrow E(\rho) \geq \sum_k p_k E(\rho_k).$$

This condition postulates, that entanglement cannot increase on average [2, 6]. It is straight forward to show that our main Observations 1-3 remain valid also for the stronger Condition (ii').

First, let us consider operations of the form $\Lambda(\rho) = [A \otimes B] \rho [A \otimes B]^\dagger$. Obviously, these operations Λ do not create an additional mixture,

$$|\chi\rangle\langle\chi| = [A \otimes B] |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| [A \otimes B]^\dagger, \quad (20)$$

$$E(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \geq E\left(\frac{\Lambda(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)}{\text{tr } \Lambda(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)}\right). \quad (21)$$

In this case (ii) and (ii') are equivalent. Thus, the local invertable operation T deliver the same results of ordering of quantum states as concluded in Sec. II C. The universal measures are independent of the Schmidt coefficients, see Observation 1 as derived from Definition 2. If Λ has the form of a local projection P , then the monotonic behavior with respect to the Schmidt number in Observation 2 follows immediately as shown in Section II D. Thus, the Observations 1 and 2 are also true for (ii').

Starting from the generator $|\tilde{\psi}_r\rangle$ of the quantum state σ_r , we obtain an additional mixture, see Eq. (17),

$$\sigma_r = \sum_k p_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|. \quad (22)$$

It follows from Condition (ii') that the operation defined in Eq. (17) delivers

$$E(|\tilde{\psi}_r\rangle\langle\tilde{\psi}_r|) \geq \sum_k p_k E(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|). \quad (23)$$

Therefore, the results of Observation 3 – the generator $|\tilde{\psi}_r\rangle$ of the quantum state σ_r delivers an upper boundary of the amount of entanglement – remains valid if we assume (ii') instead of (ii). In all of our considered cases the condition (ii') delivers the same results as condition (ii).

G. Preliminary results

So far we have seen that the term maximally entangled state can be used only with respect to a given measure, which led us to the Definition 2 of a universal measure. In general, an entanglement measure has a monotonic behavior with respect to the Schmidt number, see Observation 2. Under all maximally entangled states for a given measure must exist a pure state, see Observation 3. At this point the role of the Schmidt number for arbitrary mixed states as a universal entanglement measure becomes clear. Thus, a natural interest for the identification of the Schmidt number of a quantum state arises. In the first instance entanglement is quantified by the Schmidt number. In a next step, the Schmidt coefficients may further refine this quantification, in particular for special protocols.

For any practical application, an entanglement measure needs to be found for the given experimental setup. This measure should quantify the usable amount of entanglement of a quantum state to be used for the given task. Examples of such tasks are the distillation protocols. In this context, a state that cannot be distilled has the same usable amount of entanglement like a separable quantum state. This observation leads us to a generalization of the concept of entanglement measures, which will be discussed in the following.

III. PSEUDO-MEASURES, AND OPERATIONAL MEASURES

The above discussions of entanglement measures in the context of a certain task leads to a generalization of entanglement measures. Condition (i) in Definition 1 can be relaxed to define pseudo-measures.

Definition 3 *The non-negative function E is a pseudo-measure for the LOCC $\mathcal{C}_X$, if:*

- (i') σ separable $\Rightarrow E(\sigma) = 0$,
- (ii) $\forall \Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_X : E(\rho) \geq E\left(\frac{\Lambda(\rho)}{\text{tr } \Lambda(\rho)}\right)$.

The new condition (i') implies that even an entangled state can have a vanishing amount of usable entanglement, for a given quantum task to be specified by $\mathcal{C}_X$. Now let us consider the application and usefulness of pseudo-measures.

A. Example: PT entanglement

For example, let us consider the Peres criterion for the partial transposition (PT) [29]. A state is entangled, if it does not remain a quantum state under PT, $\rho^{\text{PT}} \not\geq 0$. Entangled states ρ_{BE} with a positive PT are bound entangled states. These states cannot be used for distillation protocols. Thus we need to define an entanglement pseudo-measure E_{PT} , with

$$\rho^{\text{PT}} \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow E_{\text{PT}}(\rho) = 0, \quad (24)$$

$$\forall \Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{distill}} : E_{\text{PT}}(\rho) \geq E_{\text{PT}}\left(\frac{\Lambda(\rho)}{\text{tr } \Lambda(\rho)}\right). \quad (25)$$

The LOCC $\mathcal{C}_{\text{distill}}$ are the allowed operations for a distillation protocol. Since all separable quantum states σ remain non-negative under PT, it follows $E_{\text{PT}}(\sigma) = 0$. However, a state with a non-negative PT is in general not separable, but $E_{\text{PT}}(\rho_{\text{BE}}) = 0$. We conclude that Eqs. (24) and (25) define the pseudo-measure E_{PT} with respect to Definition 3. But, it is not an entanglement measure, see Definition 1.

One possible way for the construction of such a measures is given by measures based on entanglement witnesses, see [30, 31],

$$E_{\text{Witness}}(\rho) = -\inf_W \{\text{tr}(\rho W)\} = \sup_W \{-\text{tr}(\rho W)\}, \quad (26)$$

with entanglement witnesses W of a given form. A quantum state ρ has a negative PT, if and only if there exists a positive operator, $C = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, with

$$\text{tr}(\rho^{\text{PT}} C) = \text{tr}(\rho C^{\text{PT}}) < 0. \quad (27)$$

As we have seen above, any $|\psi\rangle$ can be generated by a $|\phi_r\rangle$ and local invertibles and local projections. Thus C^{PT} can be generated by a certain $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{sep}}$ and $C^{\text{PT}} = \Lambda(V)$, with

$$V = (|\phi_r\rangle\langle\phi_r|)^{\text{PT}} = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{k,l=1}^r |k, l\rangle\langle l, k|. \quad (28)$$

We may define the following entanglement pseudo-measure

$$E_{\text{PT}}(\rho) = \sup_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{sep}}} \left(-\frac{\text{tr}[\Lambda(\rho)V]}{\text{tr } \Lambda(\rho)} \right). \quad (29)$$

This pseudo-measure fulfills Eq. (24), since a PPT entangled state cannot be distilled. And, it fulfills Eq. (25), since $\mathcal{C}_{\text{distill}}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{sep}}$.

B. Operational Entanglement Measures

Let us generalize this situation. We consider an experimental measurement given by the Hermitian operator M . Now we use the entanglement condition $\text{tr } \rho M > f_{12}(M)$, see Ref. [25] or Appendix B, together with the maximal expectation value $f(M) = \sup\{\langle\psi|M|\psi\rangle : \langle\psi|\psi\rangle = 1\}$ to define an operational measure E_M .

Definition 4 An operational measure E_M is a pseudo measure defined by

$$E_M(\rho) = \sup_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_\mathcal{X}} \frac{\text{tr} \left(\frac{\Lambda(\rho)}{\text{tr} \Lambda(\rho)} M \right) - f_{12}(M)}{f(M) - f_{12}(M)}.$$

This definition is analogous to the definition of an operational measure for nonclassicality, see [32].

From the experimental point of view we have different devices. The set $\mathcal{X}$ denotes the action Λ_k of the k -th devices onto the quantum state, which act on each mode separately, or by classical communication. Thus, $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{X}$ defines arbitrary combinations of the used devices. The definition of the operational measure E_M obviously fulfills the Definition 3 for the LOCC given by $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{X}$. For $M = -V$ and $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C}_{\text{sep}}$ we obtain the operational measure for E_{PT} , with $f_{12}(-V) = 0$.

Some measurements do not use any entanglement. In this case, $f(M) = f_{12}(M)$, we define $E_M \equiv 0$. The setup is not adequate for the detection of entanglement. In general, if the operational entanglement vanishes, $E_M(\rho) = 0$, then the state is either separable or the setup cannot use the specific kind of entanglement of the state ρ . The maximally entangled states are states ρ_{max} together with an operation $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_\mathcal{X}$, such that

$$\text{tr} \left(\frac{\Lambda(\rho_{\text{max}})}{\text{tr} \Lambda(\rho_{\text{max}})} M \right) = f(M). \quad (30)$$

The amount of operational entanglement of this state is $E_M(\rho_{\text{max}}) = 1$. This is equivalent to the statement, that the state ρ_{max} under the transformation Λ is within the range of the maximal eigenvalue of M . Let us summarize these statements in the following proposition.

Proposition 1 The operational entanglement E_M has the following properties:

1. The operational entanglement is a value between zero and one.
2. The operational entanglement vanishes, $E_M(\rho) = 0$, if and only if the state is separable or $(M, \mathcal{C}_\mathcal{X})$ cannot use the specific kind of entanglement of the state ρ .
3. The operational entanglement is maximal, if and only if the state ρ_{max} under the transformation $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_\mathcal{X}$ is within the range of the maximal eigenvalue of the observable M .

■

IV. IDENTIFICATION OF THE SCHMIDT NUMBER

Due to the fact that the Schmidt number is based on the fundamental superposition principle of quantum physics and because of its independence of the

Schmidt coefficients, it is a universal entanglement measure. Above we discussed general entanglement measures and their monotonic behavior with respect to the Schmidt number. Due to the importance of the identification of the Schmidt number, we will derive such methods in the following.

A. Generalized SE Problem

In Sec. IIC we have seen, that the Schmidt number as an universal entanglement measure requires a superior handling. A high Schmidt number indicates a large amount of entanglement with respect to an arbitrary entanglement measure. In the following we aim to generalize the optimal entanglement condition as given in Ref. [25], see also Appendix B, for states with arbitrary Schmidt number and arbitrary observables L . Further on we aim to construct optimized quasi-probability distributions P_{Ent} , cf. [28], for such states. In both cases we will obtain generalized SE equations for the optimization procedure.

Let us denote by the convex set $\mathcal{S}_r$ the set of quantum states ρ , with a Schmidt number less or equal to r , see [9]. Since the definition given in Eq. (6) is not in a useful form for our purposes, we use a weaker characterization. It is obvious that a pure state has a Schmidt number less or equal to r , if and only if it can be written as

$$|\psi_r\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^r |x_k, y_k\rangle, \quad (31)$$

with $|x_k, y_k\rangle$, in general, neither orthogonal nor normalized, and $\langle\psi|\psi\rangle = 1$.

In general, the Schmidt number r_S can only be smaller or equal to the dimension of the lower dimensional Hilbert space,

$$r_S \leq \min\{d_1, d_2\}, \quad (32)$$

with $d_1 = \dim \mathcal{H}_1$, and $d_2 = \dim \mathcal{H}_2$. It is obvious, that $\mathcal{S}_1$ is the set of separable quantum states, and $\mathcal{S}_{\min\{d_1, d_2\}}$ is the set of all quantum state. The maximally entangled states for the entanglement measure r_S are all states within the difference $\mathcal{S}_{\min\{d_1, d_2\}} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min\{d_1, d_2\}-1}$. For each r holds: $\mathcal{S}_r$ is a subset of $\mathcal{S}_{r+1}$.

The identification via witnesses of such states was considered in [8, 9]. A state ρ has a Schmidt number larger than r , if and only if it exists a Hermitian operator W , such that $\text{tr}(\rho W) < 0$ and for all σ_r (quantum states with a Schmidt number less or equal to r) holds $\text{tr}(\sigma_r W) \geq 0$. Following the proof in Ref. [25], we can make the following proposition.

Proposition 2 A quantum state ρ has a Schmidt number larger than r , if and only if it exists a Hermitian operator L , such that $\text{tr}(\rho L) > f_{12}^{(r)}(L)$, with

$$f_{12}^{(r)}(L) = \sup\{\langle\psi_r|L|\psi_r\rangle : |\psi_r\rangle \text{ as defined in Eq. (31)}\}.$$

■

For determining $f_{12}^{(r)}(L)$, an optimization procedure will be derived for convex combinations of such states, which generalizes the optimization presented in [25]:

$$g[(|x_i\rangle)_{i=1}^r, (|y_i\rangle)_{i=1}^r] = \langle \psi_r | L | \psi_r \rangle \rightarrow \text{optimum} \quad (33)$$

$$h[(|x_i\rangle)_{i=1}^r, (|y_i\rangle)_{i=1}^r] = \langle \psi_r | \psi_r \rangle - 1 = 0, \quad (34)$$

with the normalization condition h for the vector $|\psi_r\rangle$ as defined in Eq. (31). The method for the optimization of g under the condition h with a Lagrange multiplier λ delivers ($\forall i = 1, \dots, r$)

$$\lambda \sum_j \langle y_i | y_j \rangle |x_j\rangle = \sum_j \langle y_i | L | y_j \rangle |x_j\rangle \quad (35)$$

$$\lambda \sum_j \langle x_i | x_j \rangle |y_j\rangle = \sum_j \langle x_i | L | x_j \rangle |y_j\rangle. \quad (36)$$

together with

$$\langle y_i | L | y_j \rangle = \text{tr}_2 [L (\mathbb{I}_1 \otimes |y_j\rangle\langle y_i|)], \quad (37)$$

$$\langle x_i | L | x_j \rangle = \text{tr}_1 [L (|x_j\rangle\langle x_i| \otimes \mathbb{I}_2)]. \quad (38)$$

A substitution with $X = (\langle x_i | x_j \rangle)_{i,j}$, $Y = (\langle y_i | y_j \rangle)_{i,j}$, $|\vec{x}\rangle = (|x_i\rangle)_i$, $|\vec{y}\rangle = (|y_i\rangle)_i$, $L_{\vec{x}} = (\langle x_i | L | x_j \rangle)_{i,j}$, $L_{\vec{y}} = (\langle y_i | L | y_j \rangle)_{i,j}$ leads to the following definition.

Definition 5 *The equations*

$$L_{\vec{y}} |\vec{x}\rangle = \lambda (Y \otimes \mathbb{I}_1) |\vec{x}\rangle,$$

$$L_{\vec{x}} |\vec{y}\rangle = \lambda (X \otimes \mathbb{I}_2) |\vec{y}\rangle$$

are called *r-SE equations*. λ is the *r-SE*, and $|\psi_r\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^r |x_k, y_k\rangle$ is the *r-SE vector*.

These are linear equations for the system given by $\mathbb{C}^r \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathbb{C}^r \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, respectively. We obtain $X = \text{tr}_1 |\vec{x}\rangle\langle\vec{x}|$ and $Y = \text{tr}_2 |\vec{y}\rangle\langle\vec{y}|$. The operators $X, Y : \mathbb{C}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^r$ are Hermitian and positive semi-definite. If the Schmidt number of the *r-SE*-vector $|\psi\rangle$ is equal to r , then $\exists X^{-1}, Y^{-1}$ symmetric, positive definite.

For the case $r = 1$ we obtain the SE equations, see Eq. (B3),

$$\lambda |x\rangle = \langle y | L | y \rangle |x\rangle \quad \lambda |y\rangle = \langle x | L | x \rangle |y\rangle, \quad (39)$$

under the given condition h : $\langle x, y | x, y \rangle - 1 \equiv 0$. A Schmidt number r -witness is under study, if and only if $f_{12}^{(r)}(L) < f(L)$. We obtain $f_{12}^{(r)}(L)$ as the largest *r-SE* of L ,

Proposition 3 $f_{12}^{(r)}(L) = \sup\{\lambda : \lambda \text{ r-SE of } L\}$ ■

The identification of the Schmidt number reduces to the solution of algebraic equations as given by Definition 5. Thus in principle any optimized Schmidt number r witness can be calculated, with an appropriate solution algorithm for the *r-SE* equations.

B. Quasi-Probability Distributions

Another approach for identifying the Schmidt number is based on quasi-probability distributions for entanglement. Any quantum state ρ can be given as a local pseudomixture,

$$\rho = (1 + \mu)\sigma - \mu\sigma', \quad (40)$$

with σ and σ' being separable states and $\mu \geq 0$, see [26, 27]. In Ref. [28] we introduced optimized quasi-probability distribution, P_{Ent} , for entanglement. They have negativities, if and only if the state ρ is entangled,

$$\rho = \int dP_{\text{Ent}}(x, y) |x, y\rangle\langle x, y|.$$

The generalization from $r = 1$ to arbitrary Schmidt number states ($r > 1$) is straightforward. The proof for the optimization is exactly the same as for the case $r = 1$, see [28]. Thus, we can give the following proposition.

Proposition 4 *A quantum state ρ has a Schmidt number $> r$, if and only if $P_{r-\text{Ent}}(\psi) < 0$ for a state $|\psi\rangle$ as given in Eq. (31),*

$$\rho = \int P_{r-\text{Ent}}(\psi_r) |\psi_r\rangle\langle\psi_r|. \quad (41)$$

This optimized $P_{r-\text{Ent}}$ can be obtained by solving the *r-SE* problem for the state ρ . The *r-SEs* λ_k and *r-SE* vectors $|\chi_k\rangle$ deliver the following solution,

$$\rho = \sum_l p_l |\chi_l\rangle\langle\chi_l| \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_k = \langle\chi_k|\rho|\chi_k\rangle. \quad (42)$$

Defining $\vec{p} = (p_l)_l$, $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_k)_k$, and the matrix $\mathbf{G} = (|\langle\chi_k|\chi_l\rangle|^2)_{k,l}$ yields the linear equation $\mathbf{G}\vec{p} = \vec{\lambda}$, which must be solved (for details see [28]).

Obviously, the largest integer R , for which $P_{R-\text{Ent}}$ is a classical probability-distribution for a given state ρ , is the Schmidt number r_S of the state, $r_S(\rho) = R$. This means that for any $r \geq R$ the state has a positive quasi-probability $P_{r-\text{Ent}}$, but for any $r < R$ the state has negativities in $P_{r-\text{Ent}}$.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have proved that the Schmidt number of a pure state has a larger influence on the amount of entanglement than its Schmidt coefficients. In particular, the Schmidt number yields a discontinuous entanglement quantification which preserves the requirements of a measure under very general conditions. To account for this fact, we have defined universal entanglement measures, which are invariant under local invertible transformations and hence independent of the Schmidt coefficients. Further on we have shown that any entanglement measure has a monotonic behavior with respect to

the Schmidt number. Since the Schmidt number represents the superposition principle of quantum physics, its general importance for the boundaries of the amount of entanglement has a clear physical background, which is deeply related to the main differences between quantum and classical physics.

For many applications of entangled states it is important to quantify the usable amount of entanglement directly for a quantum protocol of interest. For this purpose, we have considered entanglement pseudo-measures for a task, which is specified by the used set of LOCC. This set plays an important role for the problem of the quantification of entanglement by a properly defined pseudo-measure. The pseudo-measure is zero, whenever the entanglement of a given quantum state is not useful for the application under consideration. In terms of pseudo-measures such states are equivalent to separable states, even though they may be entangled. The pseudo-measures are Schmidt number monotones. However, for the entanglement quantification by pseudo-measures the Schmidt coefficients of the states become relevant, unless to the situation for the universal entanglement quantification.

The entanglement pseudo-measures can be further specified as operational measures. In this case the observables to be observed by the given experimental setup are included in the definition. It is important that all operational measures are also Schmidt number monotones. Thus, the Schmidt number gives universal limits for all types of quantum tasks using entanglement as a resource.

In order to perform the universal entanglement quantification, we have derived optimized conditions to identify the Schmidt number of any state in terms of general Hermitian operators. The needed optimization procedure leads to a set of algebraic equations. This method can be also applied to derive quasi-probability distributions for the representation of states with a distinct Schmidt number.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through SFB 652.

APPENDIX A: LOCAL TRANSFORMATIONS

The set $\mathcal{C}_{LU}$ must be included in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$. The condition (ii) delivers for an arbitrary quantum state ρ and an arbitrary local unitary transformation $\rho' = [U_1 \otimes U_2]\rho[U_1 \otimes U_2]^\dagger$ (together with $\rho = [U_1 \otimes U_2]^\dagger \rho' [U_1 \otimes U_2]$):

$$E(\rho) \geq E(\rho') \quad \text{and} \quad E(\rho') \geq E(\rho). \quad (\text{A1})$$

In Eq. (9) we consider the maximally entangled state $\rho_{\max}$, with $E(\rho_{\max}) = \text{maximal}$. Now let us prove that

the state $\rho'_{\max}$ has the same property for the measure E' :

$$\begin{aligned} E'(\rho'_{\max}) &= E\left(\frac{\Lambda_{LI}(\rho'_{\max})}{\text{tr}\Lambda_{LI}(\rho'_{\max})}\right) \\ &= E\left(\frac{\Lambda_{LI}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{LI}^{-1}(\rho_{\max})}{\text{tr}\Lambda_{LI}^{-1}(\rho_{\max})}\right)}{\text{tr}\Lambda_{LI}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{LI}^{-1}(\rho_{\max})}{\text{tr}\Lambda_{LI}^{-1}(\rho_{\max})}\right)}\right) \\ &= E\left(\frac{\Lambda_{LI}\Lambda_{LI}^{-1}(\rho_{\max})}{\text{tr}\Lambda_{LI}\Lambda_{LI}^{-1}(\rho_{\max})}\right) \\ &= E(\rho_{\max}) = \text{maximal}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

In addition, we let us now prove that the set $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}'}$ satisfies Condition (ii) in Definition 1. It is obvious that

$$\Lambda_{LI} \circ \Lambda' = \Lambda_{LI} \circ (\Lambda_{LI}^{-1} \circ \Lambda \circ \Lambda_{LI}) = \Lambda \circ \Lambda_{LI}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Now we can obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} E'\left(\frac{\Lambda'(\rho)}{\text{tr}\Lambda'(\rho)}\right) &= E\left(\frac{\Lambda_{LI} \circ \Lambda'(\rho)}{\text{tr}\Lambda_{LI} \circ \Lambda'(\rho)}\right) \\ &= E\left(\frac{\Lambda \circ \Lambda_{LI}(\rho)}{\text{tr}\Lambda \circ \Lambda_{LI}(\rho)}\right) \\ &= E\left(\frac{\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda_{LI}(\rho)}{\text{tr}\Lambda_{LI}(\rho)}\right)}{\text{tr}\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda_{LI}(\rho)}{\text{tr}\Lambda_{LI}(\rho)}\right)}\right) \\ &\leq E\left(\frac{\Lambda_{LI}(\rho)}{\text{tr}\Lambda_{LI}(\rho)}\right) = E'(\rho). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

APPENDIX B: THE SEPARABILITY EIGENVALUE PROBLEM

In [24] it was shown that for every entangled state ρ exists an Hermitian operator W , such that $\text{tr}(\rho W) < 0$ and for all σ separable $\text{tr}(\sigma W) \geq 0$. In our contribution [25] we reformulated this problem of finding such an operator W . After an optimization we showed that a state ρ is entangled, if and only if there exists a bounded Hermitian operators L with

$$f_{12}(L) < \text{tr}(\rho L), \quad (\text{B1})$$

whereas the function f_{12} is defined as the least upper bound of expectation values of L for pure separable states,

$$f_{12}(L) = \sup\{\langle a, b | L | a, b \rangle : \langle a | a \rangle = \langle b | b \rangle = 1\}. \quad (\text{B2})$$

The calculation of the value $f_{12}(L)$ leads to the so-called SE equations,

$$L_b | a \rangle = g | a \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad L_a | b \rangle = g | b \rangle, \quad (\text{B3})$$

with the constraints $\langle a | a \rangle = \langle b | b \rangle = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} L_a &= \text{tr}_1 [L (|a\rangle\langle a| \otimes \mathbb{I}_2)], \\ L_b &= \text{tr}_2 [L (\mathbb{I}_1 \otimes |b\rangle\langle b|)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

The SE equations are (ordinary) eigenvalue equation for the modes 1 and 2. Thus they can be solved with methods derived for the (ordinary) eigenvalue problem. The least upper bound of all SEs g gives the value of the desired function, $f_{12}(L) = \sup\{g : g \text{ SE}\}$, which is needed to obtain the left-hand-side of condition (B1). In addition,

it is useful to define the maximal eigenvalue of L as

$$f(L) = \sup\{\langle\psi|L|\psi\rangle : \langle\psi|\psi\rangle = 1\}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

-
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
 - [2] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
 - [3] A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
 - [4] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2881 (1992).
 - [5] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
 - [6] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, *Physics Reports* **474**, 1 (2009).
 - [7] R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
 - [8] A. Sanpera, D. Bruß, and M. Lewenstein, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 050301(R) (2001).
 - [9] B. M. Terhal and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 040301(R) (2000).
 - [10] D. Bruß, J. I. Cirac, P. Horodecki, F. Hulpke, B. Kraus, M. Lewenstein, and A. Sanpera, *J. Mod. Opt.* **49**, 1399-1418 (2002).
 - [11] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2275 (1997).
 - [12] G. Vidal, *J. Mod. Opt.* **47**, 355 (2000).
 - [13] V. Vedral and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 1619 (1998).
 - [14] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).
 - [15] A. Uhlmann, *Open Sys. Inf. Dyn.* **5**, 209 (1998).
 - [16] J. Eisert and M. B. Plenio, *J. Mod. Opt.* **46**, 145-154 (1999).
 - [17] D. Gross, S. T. Flammia, and J. Eisert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 190501 (2009).
 - [18] G. Y. Xiang, T. C. Ralph, A. P. Lund, N. Walk, and G. J. Pryde, e-print arXiv:0907.3638 [quant-ph].
 - [19] E. Chitambar and R. Duan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 110502 (2009).
 - [20] Ll. Masanes, *J. Math. Phys.* **49**, 022102 (2008).
 - [21] Ll. Masanes, Y.-C. Liang, and A. C. Doherty, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 090403 (2008).
 - [22] Ll. Masanes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 150501 (2006).
 - [23] J. Sperling and W. Vogel, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 052313 (2009).
 - [24] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **223**, 1 (1996).
 - [25] J. Sperling and W. Vogel, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 022318 (2009).
 - [26] A. Sanpera, R. Tarrach and G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 826 (1998).
 - [27] G. Vidal and R. Tarrach, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 141 (1999).
 - [28] J. Sperling and W. Vogel, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 042337 (2009).
 - [29] A. Peres, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1413 (1996).
 - [30] F. G. S. L. Brandao, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 022310 (2005).
 - [31] F. G. S. L. Brandao and R. O. Vianna, *Int. J. Quantum Inform.* **4**, 331 (2006).
 - [32] C. Gehrke and W. Vogel, e-print arXiv:0904.3390 [quant-ph].